HOW TO BE SUCCESSFUL IN THE NIH PEER REVIEW PROCESS FOR GRANTS

Olivia T. Preble, Ph.D.

OBJECTIVES

To provide an overview of the NIH peer review process for research grants, the review criteria used by the reviewers, the types of grants available for beginning investigators, and tips for preparing the most successful applications in today's research funding climate.

OUTLINE

I. Background

A. Each NIH Institute has a specific mission, responsibility for particular areas of science, and different policies and paylines for extramural grants.

B. Intramural vs. Extramural budget distribution

C. Kinds of extramural awards: grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts

D. Solicited vs. unsolicited applications

II. The NIH Dual Peer Review System

A. Application Receipt Dates

B. Review "cycles" for Grants

C. Assignment of applications for review and award

D. Review by the Center for Scientific Review vs. Review by an Institute

E. Roles of the Scientific Review Administrator and the Program Officer

F. What happens at study section meetings

G. Review criteria for research grant applications

H. Outcomes of the review

I. What summary statements are and aren't

J. What determines which awards are made

III. Types of Grants for New Investigators

A. Career Development ("K") Awards

B. Small Grants

C. Pros and Cons of Participating in a Program Project

IV. Hints for Preparing More Competitive Grant Applications

A. General Do's and Don'ts

B. The Research Plan

C. Budgets

D. Biosketches

E. Literature Cited

F. Description

G. Most common reasons for unsuccessful applications

H. Tips to remember

V. Reinventing Peer Review: New Trends and Changes to Watch for in the Future

A. Electronic Research Administration

B. "On Time" applications

C. Modular Grants

D. Reorganization of Study Sections